

Table 2. Summary of Environmental Consequences.

<b>Issue</b>	<b>Alternative 1 (No Federal Funding)</b>	<b>Alternative 2 (Provided only by private development)</b>	<b>Alternative 3 (Utilizing Federal Funding)</b>
Listed species	Would be reviewed within state to avoid adverse impacts.	Would be reviewed under Chapter 30 permitting authority.	Would be reviewed by both Wisconsin DNR and USFWS personnel to ensure no adverse impact. If possibility of unacceptable impact, closer environmental review may be done. DNR review would be done under Chapter 30 permitting authority.
Cultural resources	Would be reviewed by SHPO under Wisconsin law.	Would be reviewed under Chapter 30 permitting authority.	Would be reviewed by SHPO under both State and Federal law. If possibility of adverse impact, closer environmental review may be done. DNR review would be done under Chapter 30 permitting authority.
Floodplains	Would be reviewed within State under Wisconsin laws and permitting process.	Protection only through Corps permitting.	Would be reviewed by both Wisconsin DNR and USFWS personnel to ensure no adverse impact. If possibility of unacceptable impact, closer environmental review may be done. DNR review would be done under Chapter 30 permitting authority.
Wetlands	Would be reviewed within State under Wisconsin laws and permitting process.	Largely protected through Corps permitting and Chapter 30 permitting authority.	Would be reviewed by both Wisconsin DNR and USFWS personnel to ensure no adverse impact. If possibility of unacceptable impact, closer environmental review may be done.
Invasive Species	State would attempt to minimize the chance of introductions through public education and facility design considerations.	Little if any consideration given. Provision to control invasive species during construction activities would be required under Chapter 30 permitting authority.	Would be reviewed by both Wisconsin DNR and USFWS personnel to minimize risk of adverse impact. If possibility of unreasonable risk to sensitive areas, closer environmental review may be done.
Environmental Justice	State would address identified issues.	Little if any consideration given.	Would be reviewed by both Wisconsin DNR and USFWS to ensure that all issues are identified. If possibility of adverse impact, closer review may be done.
Public Involvement	State would still address controversy.	Public would typically have minimal input.	Public notification of intended plans, if controversy continues, may result in site specific NEPA process that would tend to be more open because it has both State and Federal oversight.
No Access Waterway	State would give consideration if an issue.	Little if any consideration given.	Would be reviewed by both Wisconsin DNR and USFWS to determine if an issue. If possibility of adverse impact, closer review may be done.

<b>Issue</b>	<b>Alternative 1 (No Federal Funding)</b>	<b>Alternative 2 (Provided only by private development)</b>	<b>Alternative 3 (Utilizing Federal Funding)</b>
Cumulative Impacts	State would give consideration if an issue.	Little if any consideration given.	Would be reviewed by both Wisconsin DNR and USFWS to determine if an issue. If possibility of adverse impact, closer review may be done.
Traffic Flow and Safety	State would give consideration if an issue.	Little if any consideration given.	Would be reviewed by both Wisconsin DNR and USFWS to determine if an issue. If possibility of adverse impact, closer review may be done.
Accessibility	State would still design sites to be accessible according to law.	Legally required to provide, only enforcement is civil suits.	Would assure compliance and provide more funds to allow opportunity to consider additional options.
Ability to meet public demand for more facilities	Diminished because of reduced funding available.	Would be large unmet except in few instances where it would be economically viable.	Would maximize the ability to address the current demand.
Ability to utilize dedicated Federal Aid boating funds	Would not be done through construction, some may be utilized for maintenance.	Funds may be reverted or if not, would be under utilized.	Would ensure that all boating funds were fully utilized.